

Minutes
Commission on Improving the Status of Children in Indiana
Strategic Planning Meeting
September 21, 2016, 9:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.
Indiana Government Center, Conference Room A

Members Present:

- Dr. Jerome Adams, Indiana State Health Commissioner, Indiana State Department of Health
- Brian Bailey, Director, State Budget Agency
- Christine Blessinger, Director, Department of Correction, Division of Youth Services
- Mary Beth Bonaventura, Director, Indiana Department of Child Services
- Representative David Frizzell
- Senator Travis Holdman
- Larry Landis, Executive Director, Public Defender Council
- Senator Tim Lanane
- Susan Lightfoot, Chief Probation Officer, Henry County Probation Department
- Danielle McGrath, Deputy Chief of Staff, Office of the Governor
- Kevin Moore, Director, Division of Mental Health and Addiction
- David Powell, Executive Director, Indiana Prosecuting Attorneys Council
- Representative Vanessa Summers
- Glenda Ritz, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Indiana Department of Education
- Justice Loretta Rush, Chief Justice of Indiana
- Dr. John Wernert, M.D., Secretary, Indiana Family and Social Services Administration
- Mary Willis, Chief Administrative Officer, Indiana Office of Judicial Administration
- Greg Zoeller, Indiana Attorney General

1. Welcome and Introductions

Chief Justice Rush welcomed all attendees to the meeting. Several task force chairs were in attendance, including Dr. Susan Lockwood, Educational Outcomes; Sam Criss and Dr. Jennifer Walthall, Infant Mortality and Child Health; Julie Whitman, Data Sharing and Mapping; Don Travis, Cross-System Youth; and Rep. Wendy McNamara, Child Services Oversight Committee. Holly Merz, Casey Family Programs; and Kay Kornmeier and Kristie McCullough, Clarus Consulting Group were also present.

2. Review of Previous Meeting and Agenda

Consultant facilitators Kristie McCullough and Kay Kornmeier first provided an overview of the August 17, 2016 strategic planning session. Chief Justice Rush noted two significant decisions made at that meeting: 1) the Data Sharing and Mapping Task Force will be established as a permanent subcommittee for CISC, and 2) the Child Services Oversight Committee will remain active. The agenda for the day's strategic planning session was discussed.

3. Small Groups on Operational Priorities

The CISC then split into three breakout groups to discuss methodology and objectives for the CISC's operational priorities. The three groups all had different assigned priorities: one group focused on Structure & Resources/Assignments & Workflow; another worked on Communication & Collaboration; and the third examined Recommendations & Legislation/Outcomes & Impact. The Executive Committee members were divided amongst these groups, and Task Force chairs were invited to participate in the discussions.

After the small groups completed their tasks, each group reported back to the CISC on the results of their efforts. The Communication & Collaboration group reported back first, through Kay Kornmeier. The group suggested the creation of a standing communication committee as well as the hiring of an executive director for the CISC. Attorney General Zoeller discussed some potential short term mechanisms for funding the position and asked where that individual would reside. Chief Justice Rush offered to find space for that person. Steps in that process will include interviews, determining funding, and writing a job description. The goal will be to have a qualified person in that position before 2017. Ms. Kornmeier identified the Communication group's concern with using the media effectively. All three branches of government should be sending out the same message at the same time. Examples included effective use of all types of social media. Further recommendations included formal submission of ideas from Task Forces to the CISC and identification of communication contacts for all members of the CISC.

Holly Merz then spoke on behalf of the Structure & Resources group. The group proposed a "Linked In" structure between the Task Forces, CISC, and Executive Committee. Defined responsibilities for the incoming Executive Director are also necessary to ensure efficient function of the CISC and Task Forces. The CISC should officially launch each Task Force through a charter. Such a document would identify the membership of the Task Force, list its purpose, and generally outline desired outcomes. Task Forces have been requesting this sort of clear direction from CISC. The Task Force's responsibilities, chairs or co-chairs, and values would be clearly delineated so that the Task Force would have appropriate guidance from the CISC as to what it should be doing. The document would provide clear goals, objectives, and timeframes. Task Force charters would be renewable each May. Structurally, Task Forces could have fewer members and could utilize task-focused sub-committees to complete specific objectives. Tasks could be suggested by the CISC, the Executive Committee, specific agencies, the legislature, or the Task Force themselves. Those suggestions would be funneled through the CISC for approval.

Kristie McCullough then reported on behalf of the Recommendations & Legislation group. The group discussed the handling of both requests from the legislature and the proposal or endorsement of legislation to the legislature. This is situation-specific: because of the nature of the legislative process, some legislation requires an extremely rapid response or the opportunity to respond is lost. Ms. McCullough outlined a rough process discussed by the group to deal with these requests. If time permits, a Task Force is assigned to review a piece of legislation brought to the CISC for comment. Relevant data should be provided and reviewed before any recommendation is made, and there will be a check to ensure all affected are represented at the table. A timeframe will be provided to the Task Force for response, and their response will go back to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee can then decide whether to send it back to the Task Force, make the recommendation as received, send it to the full CISC for discussion, or decline to make the recommendation. This process will have to be abbreviated when the legislature requires a quick turnaround, and in some cases the Executive Committee will need to respond if there is no time for meaningful Task Force work.

The CISC also has a role in promoting legislation. Ms. McCullough explained that most of the agencies at the table have a staff person dedicated to monitoring legislation; however, most do not report to or attend CISC. Those individuals should present to CISC when they have legislative agendas that affect vulnerable youth. If a Task Force develops legislation, that legislation should be sent to the Executive Committee using a pre-developed template. The Executive Committee can then choose to send the matter to the full CISC, decide not to support the proposal, or send it back to the Task Force or a particular agency to promote.

Ms. McCullough then turned to Outcomes & Impact. CISC needs to establish clear goals and then meaningfully evaluate its performance on those goals. In part, this helps with self-promotion. The CISC must be able to demonstrate to the public the impact it is having on the state. Steps to help improve

performance in this area include a specific one-sheet template for Task Force reporting that corresponds to the Strategic Plan, use of available data and the standing data committee, bringing groups the CISC has already helped to testify, a formalized way for agencies to report metrics and other information to the CISC, and a quarterly reporting process. Ms. McCullough explained that the group discussed cultural competency, but concluded a more effective group needs to be constructed to discuss this issue, and a better definition of the priority is needed to move it forward.

4. Strategic Priorities

The CISC then divided into two groups to discuss and prioritize objectives for the strategic priorities. Those objectives could also be revised or removed, or simply affirmed as still relevant and important. The groups kept the following questions in mind: does this objective align with CISC duties? Is it within the CISC sphere of influence? Will it significantly contribute to accomplishing the CISC vision and mission? Can it be accomplished within the next three years? Are other entities better suited to this objective? The product of these discussions will be incorporated in the CISC Strategic Plan.

5. Conclusion and Next Steps

Holly Merz, Kay Kornmeier, and Kristie McCullough agreed to incorporate the groups' efforts and complete the Strategic Plan. Chief Justice Rush requested the finished Strategic Plan to be returned to the CISC before the Dec. 7 meeting. A brief discussion was held about law enforcement representation on the CISC. Chief Justice Rush noted the Indiana Prosecuting Attorneys' Council and Attorney General were both represented on the CISC, but the Indiana Sheriff's Association or other such agencies may want to participate.

6. Next Meeting – December 7, 2016

The next meeting of the CISC is scheduled on December 7, 2016 in the Indiana Supreme Court Courtroom, State House Room 317, from 10:00 AM to 2:00 PM.